



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

guarding of the world's peace rests not in great armies and navies, but in the fulfilling of those Christian duties which nations owe to each other; and deploring the inconsistency of our government in increasing its armament at the same time that it is advocating arbitration. Similar resolutions were adopted on the same day at meetings held in many parts of the country.

... On Saturday evening, July 8, at mass meetings of British and American residents of Hawaii, held in churches throughout the island, resolutions were adopted petitioning Great Britain and the United States to confirm the proposed unlimited treaty of arbitration between the two countries.

... A party of German workmen have been visiting England as guests of the Adult Schools Association.

## The Revision of Our Neutrality Laws.

By Hon. John W. Foster, Ex-Secretary of State.

ADDRESS AT THE THIRD NATIONAL PEACE CONGRESS,  
BALTIMORE, MAY 5, 1911.

In the intercourse of our country with foreign nations it is our first and most important duty to preserve the peace and cultivate relations of friendship with our coterminous neighbors. And yet within the last few weeks we have seen local disturbances in the northern States of Mexico fanned into the flames of war along the boundary line, and our entire population astounded by the rapid concentration on the frontier of a large portion of our army equipped for hostile operations. Those best informed tell us that this lamentable condition of affairs has been brought about largely by the abuse by foreigners of the contiguous territory of the United States and by the active participation of American citizens. Great quantities of arms and ammunition of war, evading our custom-houses, have been surreptitiously introduced into Mexico. Large numbers of American citizens, both singly and in bands, accoutred for war, have openly crossed the frontier and joined the forces which are seeking to overthrow a government with which we are at peace, and when worsted in battle have sought a refuge within our borders, only to return at will and take part in a contest in which we should properly be neutral. A so-styled "provisional Governor of Chihuahua" has openly established his office in El Paso, Texas, and therefrom issued his orders and carried on warlike correspondence across the frontier, while insurrectionary chiefs in other localities on American territory were actively plotting against the established government of Mexico.

It is not necessary that we should consider the merits of the controversy in Mexico to pass judgment upon the condition of affairs on our side of the southern border. Every patriotic American citizen who has regard for the honor of his country and its reputation among the nations of the earth must deplore these events, and inquire whether there is not a remedy for them. I am satisfied that there has been a sincere desire on the part of the President and his Cabinet to enforce a strict observance of our neutrality laws. I am not so certain that a similar spirit has existed on the part of the local authorities, either Federal or State, along the frontier, where the

popular sentiment seems to be largely on the side of the insurrectionists. But whether or not the neutrality laws have been strictly enforced, it is plain to any student of our history who has given attention to the subject that they are antiquated and are in great need of revision and enlargement.

Our first neutrality act was passed during Washington's first administration, and was put into its present shape in 1818. At the time of the enactment it marked a great advance in international law and practice, and gained for our country much credit. But the laws have proved to be too limited in their scope. At that time our land frontier, both on the north and the south, was very sparsely settled. Our intercourse with foreign nations was then almost entirely by sea, and an examination of our neutrality code shows that it applies chiefly to maritime matters. The great development of our population, both on the Mexican and the Canadian border, requires a re-examination of the neutrality laws by our legislative and executive departments.

The attention of Congress has been repeatedly called to this subject, and that body has been urged to the adoption of stricter measures to enable the Executive to more fully discharge its international duties of neutrality. Following the embarrassments on our southern frontier attending the independence of Texas, and on our northern border by the Canadian rebellion, in 1838 President Van Buren in a special message laid before Congress the defective character of our neutrality laws, and asked that these laws be thoroughly revised and enlarged in order "to vest in the Executive full power to prevent injuries being inflicted upon neighboring nations by the unauthorized and unlawful acts of the citizens of the United States or other persons who may be within our jurisdiction and subject to our control." And later in his administration he repeated these recommendations. The Fenian plotting in our territory and the raids into Canada led President Arthur, in 1884, to urge again upon Congress "the prompt and thorough treatment of the question which," he said, "intimately concerns the national honor."

Notwithstanding these urgent appeals to Congress, the neutrality laws of 1818 remain unaltered with all the facts pointed out by successive Presidents. The fact that defective legislation does not relieve or excuse a nation from discharging its international obligations was made very clear after our Civil War, when our Government announced to that of Great Britain that "no sovereign power can rightfully plead the defects of its own domestic penal statutes as justification or extenuation of an international wrong to another sovereign power"; and the Geneva arbitration tribunal confirmed this principle by inflicting upon Great Britain a penalty of \$15,500,000 because of its defective legislation and neglect of its international duty. Great Britain recognized the justice of our complaint, made a thorough revision of her laws, and now stands at the front of the nations in her neutrality legislation. Unless we follow her example, we shall continue to expose ourselves to the just complaints and reclamations of Mexico and Canada.

The time at my disposal will not allow me to enter into a full discussion of the changes called for by our defective neutrality laws, but I venture to suggest briefly three modifications:

First: Some restriction should be placed upon the free commerce as a mercantile commodity of arms and munitions of war, and power should be conferred upon the President to limit or suspend, in his discretion, their export across the border in time of disturbance or insurrection.

Second: It should be made unlawful for Americans to enter the military service of any power or chief at war with a nation with which we are at peace. It was the personal aid of Americans that gave strength to the Canadian rebellion in 1838, to the late insurrection in Mexico, and to the recent civil wars in Nicaragua and Honduras. In this respect the laws of Great Britain, France, and other countries are in advance of ours. The British Foreign Enlistment Act of 1870 makes it unlawful for any British subject to enter the military service of any power at war with a nation with which its government is at peace, and it subjects them to heavy fines and imprisonment. In all its neutrality proclamations on the breaking out of hostilities in other nations, the British government notifies its subjects of the penalties they will incur under their own laws, and it further warns them that they will enter such foreign service at their own peril, in no wise obtain any protection from their own government, and must suffer such penalties as the enemy may inflict upon them. We certainly should do no less than this.

Third: Greater power should be conferred upon the President, in time of civil disturbance on the frontier, to limit or prohibit intercourse across the border, to prevent the abuse of our territory by foreign conspirators, and in his discretion to enforce martial law on our soil within the zone of disturbance.

We had a foretaste during our Civil War of what an unfriendly neutrality may do to aid our domestic enemies. The conservative government of Mexico allowed the free entrance through Matamoros and across the Rio Grande of unlimited warlike supplies for the Southern armies. The Confederate agents in Canada, harbored by a sympathetic government, were enabled to raid and burn towns, loot banks, seize and destroy steamers on the Great Lakes, and threaten the destruction of New York and Chicago. Should internal strife again unhappily visit our fair land, the recent occurrences on the Mexican frontier suggest what an imperfect neutrality might allow to be inflicted upon us. Is it not time we set our own house in order, as we exhort other nations to international peace and good-will? (Long continued applause.)

## The Avoidance of War.

From President Taft's Address at the Twenty-fifth International Convention of the Christian Endeavor Societies Held at Atlantic City July 6-12, 1911.

"But, as I say, I did not come here to tell you about your own organization. I came to talk on a subject and cause in which I have, in common with all the civilized people of the world, an intense interest, and that is the avoidance of war by providing such instrumentalities for the settlement of international controversies as to make war remote because unnecessary.

"I observe that in your last convention, the Twenty-fourth International Convention, one of your resolutions was as follows:

"*Resolved*, That, as followers of the Prince of Peace, we ally ourselves with every effort that is being made for the suppression of war. The immense and ever-increasing tax which war and preparations for war levy on peaceful industries, and the frightful horrors of war itself, demand that every lover of God and humanity should unite for its suppression."

"In the last twenty-five years we have made great progress toward an international condition in which war is less likely than heretofore. It is true that in that time we have had several great wars—the war between China and Japan, the war between Russia and Japan, the war between the United States and Spain, the war between England and the Boers, and perhaps some others. Nevertheless, as between the great countries of Europe which have armed themselves to the teeth since the German-French war of 1870, peace has been maintained; and under the inspiration of a common desire for peace, treaties have been made with reference to arbitration at The Hague, and for the establishment of a court at The Hague for the settlement of international disputes, and have pointed to an ideal of the utmost use in the promotion of the cause of peace.

"We have ameliorated in many ways the ancient cruelties of war by Red Cross agreements, by the immunity of private property on land from destruction. Now we are agreeing upon what is called the Declaration of London, which, if confirmed, as it seems likely to be, will take away from war on the sea those principles of lawful piracy that have always characterized in a naval war the dealing with the private property of the citizens of enemies.

"Just today four great powers—England, Russia, Japan, and the United States—signed a treaty by which we agreed in effect to abolish the shooting of seals at sea, in order to preserve the valuable herds on the land, and to allow them to propagate in such a way as to maintain the fur seal industry and secure for human use the valuable furs that such seals furnish. It is the beginning, I hope, of the adoption of useful game laws for the open ocean, which has heretofore been subject to the wanton and irresponsible use of men of every nation. It is the settlement by treaty of a controversy that has troubled these four nations for several generations, and it ought to be the cause of great congratulation.

"By negotiation and meditation, and the formation of arbitration agreements, wars in the last decade have been stopped in Central and South America in a most gratifying number of instances. Not all wars have been stopped in the countries lacking stability and power to enforce law and order, but that there is a marked improvement throughout Latin America in this regard, and especially in Central America, no one who has consulted the statistics of revolutions can fail to recognize.

"The heroism and exhibition of the noblest qualities of the heart and soul and mind of man that war makes possible, every student of history and of human nature must admit; but that this is accompanied with the horrible cost and sacrifice of human suffering and lives, and an associated exhibition of the lowest moral qualities in man, of ambition, lust for power, of cruelty, ghoulish rapacity and corruption, is equally true, and in very few cases, if any, can the historian say that the god of war was worth the awful sacrifice.